

REMARKS

This application was originally filed with Claims 1-37. Claims 1-37 are now pending in the application; and 1-26 are withdrawn from consideration, per Applicants' election of Claims 27-37 in the February 20, 2004 response to the restriction requirement. Claim 38 has been added herewith.

In the Office Action, Claims 27-37 are rejected.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 27-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 27 was rejected on the basis of an apparent lack of antecedent basis between elements of Lines 3 and 4. Line 3 is essentially redundant and has been eliminated herewith; and Examiner's suggestion with regard to the plural of the word "members" has been included in Line 4.

With this further clarification in Claim 27, Claims 28-37, dependent directly or indirectly therefrom, also now meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 27 and 34 are objected to on the basis of certain informalities.

One cited informality in Claim 27 is the term "plurality of conducted continuous fibers" in Line 5 as compared to the use of such term in Line 9 but lacking the word "conducted." This has been corrected.

There was also an objection on the basis of the term “plurality of conductive elements” in Line 14 of Claim 27.

It is respectfully submitted that the recitation of “plurality of conductive elements” in Line 14 is correct, since such term is consistent with its earlier use in the preceding two lines.

It is helpful to recognize that the claim, in its totality, recites that severing the conductive continuous fibers at a first surface results in forming a plurality of filaments and severing the filaments at a second surface results in forming a plurality of conductive elements. If further clarification on this point is desired, Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

With regard to Claim 34, limitation to “first exposed surfaces” was suggested to be made singular. This has been done.

NEW CLAIM

New Claim 38 has been added and is within the scope of the claims and specification as originally filed, and recites that removing spaced apart portions of said first surface results in forming a plurality of first exposed surfaces, which are then covered with a layer of electrically conductive material.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 27-37 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome § 112 rejection(s). This has been done. Therefore, Claims 27-37 should now be in condition for allowance, along with new Claim 38.

It is respectfully submitted that based on this present submission, the claims are in condition for allowance and recognition of subject matter patentable over the art of record is appreciated.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

14 June 04

By:



Linda M. Deschere
Reg. No. 34,811

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

LDES/lf-s

G:\ldescher\18540G (GM)\000118\OA due 06-24-04\Amendment.doc